

THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 18—April, 1894.

I.

THE SABBATH-SCHOOL MOVEMENT OF TO-DAY.

FROM whatever standpoint we approach the Sabbath-school question—whether as churchmen, statesmen, philanthropists, social economists, philosophers, or simply as statisticians—its importance grows upon us in proportion to the thoroughness and sweep of our investigations. It cannot be comprehended at a glance. There are over 22,000,000 persons—teachers and scholars—enrolled as members of Protestant Sunday-schools in different parts of the world. Nearly 11,000,000 of these are in the United States—more than one-sixth of our population. Eighty-eight per cent. of the entire number speak the English language or are domiciled in English-speaking countries.

These 22,000,000 Protestants are banded together in a complete network of societies, conventions, institutes, denominational and interdenominational, national and international, for correspondence, extension, mutual improvement and development. The Bible is the great text book. Here is a practical exemplification of the essential unity of Protestant Christendom. A study of the lesson-papers issued by the different Churches reveals surprisingly little divergence of teaching; and it is not at all an uncommon thing for children of different Church connections to meet in a union school and use the lesson-helps of some one denomination without the slightest misgiving on the part of any persons interested.

According to a statement made at the World's Sunday-school Convention, held last autumn at St. Louis, there are now 25,099 Sunday-schools, 81,950 teachers and 1,635,000 scholars in the differ-

VI.

KLOSTERMANN ON THE PENTATEUCH.

DR. KLOSTERMANN, the veteran professor of Old Testament Exegesis at the University of Kiel, in his recent treatise on the Pentateuch* enters a vehement protest against the methods and results of the higher critics in their work of dismemberment. This is noteworthy as the revolt of one who has held high rank in the critical world; and the more so, as it is not prompted by attachment to conservative and old-fashioned views. He breaks away from a system which no longer commends itself to his reason and good sense, though he has no idea of planting himself on traditional ground. It is not because he has fallen under the sway of old beliefs, but because the positions of the critics are seen by him to be untenable, the grounds upon which they rest untrustworthy, and their methods preposterous. And he is too independent a thinker blindly to follow the dominant leaders after the manner of the common herd of those who fill the critical ranks. The narrowness and onesidedness of the current school of Pentateuch criticism is well illustrated by his comparing them (p. v) to men who fancy that they can learn all that there is to be known about a city by gazing intently upon it from a single window. One with keener eyesight or by the aid of more powerful lenses may detect what others have not seen. But all obtain substantially the same view, because they see everything from the same point and under the same angle. Hence the unanimity of the critics; it is the natural result of their common initial position. But no one can construct an accurate map of a city by looking out upon it from one particular window.

The volume above referred to is a republication of essays from Holzhauser's *Neue Kirchliche Zeitschrift* for 1890-1892, to which are appended some of earlier date. The first series were promptly noticed in this REVIEW for April, 1891, and their significance emphasized, by Prof. Lewis B. Paton, of Hartford Theological Seminary. The reader is referred to this admirable presentation of

* *Der Pentateuch*. Beiträge zu seinem Verständniss und seiner Entstehungsgeschichte von Dr. August Klostermann, ord. Professor a. d. Univ. Kiel (*The Pentateuch*. Contributions to the Understanding of it and the History of its Origin). Leipzig, 1893, 8vo., pp. 447.

Klostermann's positions for particulars which need not be repeated here. The issue of the series complete gives occasion for a further consideration of the subject discussed in it.

Klostermann reports that a distinguished historian said to him and Prof. Bertheau: "If Wellhausen is right I renounce all respect for the entire fraternity of Old Testament scholars; for what they regarded as established truth, and declared to be such to us outsiders, proved to be the opposite of the truth on the first serious attack. If, however, Wellhausen is wrong, they really deserve no respect, for they allow his theories to spread, though subversive of the very foundations, without energetically opposing them with convincing proof that they are untenable." Prof. Klostermann does not himself seem to suspect the real cause of the paralysis which has affected such numbers of Old Testament scholars in the presence of Wellhausen's radical and revolutionary theories. It is that the critical hypotheses, to which they had already committed themselves, exposed them to a flank attack from his formidable legions, and left them defenceless, so that he swept the field at once.

Inasmuch as they had conceded that Deuteronomy must belong to the age of Josiah, on the ground that its law of the centralization of worship could not have been in existence previously, how could they longer defend the prior existence of Leviticus, which recognizes no worship but that at the tabernacle? And as they had abandoned the sure ground of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, with its abundant external supports, for the misty shapes of the alleged documents of unknown age and authorship, what valid defence could they offer against Wellhausen with his array of historical coincidences to fix the dates of documents otherwise undetermined? It is pitiable to see how those whom he has taken in his toils flounder helplessly in their vain efforts to escape, though they can oppose nothing to his definite and well-buttressed conclusions but the agnostic position that the date of the documents is not yet settled.

Prof. Klostermann had (p. 53), "more than twenty years ago, without the help of Wellhausen or Dillmann, analyzed not only Genesis and the Pentateuch, but the entire ocean of the complete work reaching to 2 Kings, put it in flasks differently ticketed, and felicitated himself on this as an assured acquisition." But with advancing knowledge and further study the whole of this imaginary riches vanished with the exception of a few drops, and he saw that the entire problem to be properly solved must be differently approached. He accordingly declines all further connection (p. iv) with that group of German critics to whom "the English scholars

Cheyne and Driver have closely allied themselves." For his "opposition to the phantasms of the literary-critical hypotheses of to-day," Cheyne calls him "a harmless Don Quixote," * apparently forgetful that the valour of the knight was directed against a windmill. He retorts by suggesting the inference to be thence drawn as to the nature of that which he had attacked.

Prof. Klostermann delivers his stout and effective blows chiefly at two of the weak points in the current Pentateuch criticism, viz.: 1. Its self-contradictory attitude towards the text. 2. Its disregard of the manifest unity of the work with which it is dealing. Unfortunately his assault is so mingled with his subjective opinions, and his own positions are so extravagant and indefensible, that his arguments are in danger of being set aside with a sneer and shrug, notwithstanding their real validity.

In basing their critical partition upon minute points of diction and phraseology, the critics assume the verbal accuracy of the text, which they in turn discredit, thus undermining their whole position. There are many points of view from which the critical argument from diction can be shown to be unreliable and illusive. But the sole point here made is that it is self-contradictory. The critics are in the habit of treating the text as though it could be moulded by them at their will. They unhesitatingly assume that it has been manipulated, and that its original form has been departed from in numberless instances, wherever, in fact, they find it convenient to do so, or have any end to be answered by it. Prof. Klostermann sharply rebukes the arbitrary character of this mode of emendation (pp. 61, 62) by "assuming errors and a disfiguration of the text whenever without this they would get into a corner with their criticism of sources or their exegesis," and "holding everything in the synagogue text, which agrees with their assumed composite theory, as undoubtedly correct, to the disregard of all other scruples or helps."

It must not be supposed, however, that Prof. Klostermann is a stickler for the accurate transmission of the text. He no more believes that we now possess it in its primitive form, or in one at all approaching it, than the critics whom he condemns. In fact he out-Herods Herod in multiplying and magnifying sources of change. He urges the liberties taken by scribes, who had more regard to the comprehension and edification of the reader than to the accurate reproduction of the copy before them; the different modes of writing and pronouncing the divine names

* *The Expositor* for August, 1891. For a subsequent attempt to fasten this appellation upon him, and thus blunt the edge of Klostermann's arguments, see Salmond's *Critical Review* for Oct., 1893, p. 391.

in different ages and places; the adoption of explanatory glosses and marginal annotations into the text; the filling out of abbreviations, inserting supposed omissions, and modernizing antiquated expressions; the varied recensions arising in different regions from free oral reproductions of narratives accompanying the laws, etc. The alterations in the language of familiar hymns in different editions lead him to expect similar transformations from the devotional use of Scripture, to adapt it to the changing wants or tastes of the congregation. He seems to have no idea of an authoritative canon of books written by inspired men, and received as the Word of God with the same pious faith as the utterances of the prophets, nor of the restraint which this would exercise on random alterations, even though it could not be expected to preclude all change. As a result Prof. Klostermann concludes that the text is now at a vast remove from its primitive form—so much so indeed that the peculiarities of diction, on which the critics rely in their partition, are not due as they conceive to the combining of distinct documents, but are really traceable to the mingling of different recensions of the same work; that thus they are in fact confusing literary with textual criticism, and converting into criteria of separate authorship diversities introduced through repeated transcription in the course of ages in the various modes above described.

The extravagant length to which Prof. Klostermann here pushes his conclusions would destroy all confidence in the existing text; and his indictment against the critics cannot be sustained in this form. But his *argumentum ad hominem* abides in full force. They do unquestionably play fast and loose with the text in a manner and to a degree which renders all their reasoning precarious.

Thus the alternation of the divine names Elohim and Jehovah is made by them the key of their whole position. This is the starting-point of the partition, and of the entire hypothesis of the separate documents. All the other criteria are supplementary to this; they are worked out on this basis, and find in it whatever justification and proof of their validity they have. All hinges ultimately, therefore, on the exact transmission of these fundamental and determining words. At the very outset the lines of demarcation are run exclusively by them; and an error in these initial lines by confusing the limits of the documents would introduce error into their respective criteria as deduced from the inspection of these faulty passages. If there is anything that must be absolutely fixed and resolutely adhered to, if the document hypothesis is to stand, it is the accuracy of these divine names, which are the pillars on which the whole critical structure rests. And yet the critics in repeated instances declare them to be incorrect or out of place.

They are in fact forced by the perplexities of their situation thus to cut away the ground from beneath their own feet. The divine names are made the prime criteria for distinguishing the so-called documents. It is said that J (the Jehovist) characteristically uses Jehovah, E (the Elohist) Elohim, and P (the priestly writer) Elohim as far as Ex. vi. 2, 3, and Jehovah thereafter. But the trouble is that with their utmost efforts the critics find it impossible to adjust their documents into conformity with this proposed scheme; though their alleged correspondence with it is the sole ultimate warrant for their existence, the supreme criterion, on which all other criteria depend. In the first place, Elohim is repeatedly found along with Jehovah in sections attributed to J. Here the critics explain that the author of this document used both names as the occasion demanded. But this is putting the use of these names on an entirely different ground from that of the distinctive usage of separate writers. If J could use both of these names, and in so doing was governed by their inherent signification and by the appropriateness of each to the connection, in which they are severally employed, why might not P and E do the same? Or why, in fact, is there any need for J, P, or E, or for any other than the one author to whom a uniform and well-accredited tradition attributes all that it has been proposed to parcel among these unknown and undiscoverable personages? The appropriate use of these divine names, as ascertained from the acknowledged employment of them by J, taken in connection with the explicit statement of Ex. vi. 3, not in the perverted sense put upon it by the critics but in its true signification as determined by the numerous parallels in the Book of Exodus and throughout the entire Old Testament, will explain their alternation in Genesis in a satisfactory manner, which the hypothetical documents have not done, and cannot do.

Again, Jehovah occurs repeatedly in sections attributed to P and E, where by the hypothesis only Elohim should be found. Every possible evasion is employed to get rid of these unwelcome facts. Where the facts are at variance with the hypothesis, the invariable assumption is that the hypothesis is right and the facts are wrong and require correction. The Redactor has for some unimaginable reason been at fault. He has inserted a verse, or a clause, or simply the unsuitable divine name of his own motion, without there being anything in the original text that corresponded to it; or he has erased the divine name that was in the text, and substituted another for it; or he has mixed two texts by inserting into the body of one document a clause supposably taken from another. And thus the attempt is made to bolster up the hypothesis by an inference drawn from the hypothesis. And the effect is to unsettle the text at those

crucial points, where accuracy and certainty are essential to the validity of the hypothesis, not to speak of the corollaries deducible from it.

Elohim occurs inconveniently for the critics in Gen. vii. 9; hence Kautzsch claims that it must have been originally Jehovah, while Dillmann insists that vers. 8 and 9 were inserted by R. The critics wish to make it appear that two accounts of the flood, by P and J respectively, have been blended in the existing text, and that vers. 7-9 is J's account, and vers. 13-16 that by P. But unfortunately for them this is blocked by the occurrence in each one of the verses assigned to J of expressions foreign to J and peculiar to P; and to cap the climax the divine name is not J's but P's. The repetition cannot, therefore, be wrested into an indication of a duplicate narrative, but simply, as its language clearly shows, emphasizes the fact that the entry into the ark was made on the selfsame day that the flood began.

"And Jehovah shut him in," vii. 16b, occurs in the midst of a P paragraph; hence it is alleged that this solitary clause has been inserted from a supposed parallel narrative by J. But this overlooks the significant and evidently intended contrast of the two divine names in this verse, a significance to which Delitzsch calls attention, thus discrediting the basis of the critical analysis, which he nevertheless accepts. Animals of every species went into the ark, as Elohim the God of creation and providence directed, mindful of the preservation of what He had made; Jehovah the guardian of His people shut Noah in. The preposterous character of the critics' explanation at once appears upon reading consecutively what they put forth as J's account. Ver. 7: "And Noah went in, and his household, into the ark because of the waters of the flood." Ver. 10: "And it came to pass after the seven days, that the waters of the flood were upon the earth." Ver. 12: "And the rain was upon the earth forty days and forty nights." Ver. 16b: "And Jehovah shut him in." This dislocated clause has no proper connection in the narrative constructed by the critics, unless they would have us believe that it had rained forty days before the door of the ark was shut.

In xiv. 22 Jehovah occurs not in a J section, and is declared spurious for that reason; though it is the name of God as known to Abram, in distinction from him as he was known to Melchizedek, ver. 19.

Chap. xvii is assigned to P because of the exclusive use of Elohim in it after ver. 1; hence it is claimed that Jehovah in ver. 1 is an error for Elohim, notwithstanding the regular recurrence of Jehovah in all that preceded since the call of Abram, xii.

1, the identity of the phrase with xii. 7, xviii. 1, and the obvious requirement of this passage. Jehovah, the God of Abram, here reveals Himself as God Almighty and Elohim to signalize His power to accomplish what nature could not effect, and to pledge the immediate fulfilment of the long delayed promise.

Chap. xx records the affair with Abimelech, and, as is usual when those not of the chosen are concerned, the name of God is Elohim until the last verse, where Jehovah's interference for the protection of Sarah is spoken of. The significance of this change of names is lost upon the critics, who assign the chapter to E because of Elohim, and then can account for Jehovah in no other way than by imputing ver. 18 to R.

In xxi. 1, 2, there is a curious specimen of critical dissection. Each verse is split in two, and one sentence fashioned out of the two first halves, and another out of the two second halves. The critical necessity for this grows out of the need of finding the birth of Isaac in both J and P. The alleged equivalence of the two clauses in ver. 1 is made a pretext for sundering them, and assigning to J: "And Jehovah visited Sarah as he had said;" and to P the rest of the verse: "And Jehovah did unto Sarah as he had spoken," which last is then filled out by ver. 2^b: "at the set time of which Elohim had spoken to him." But as it is inadmissible for Jehovah to stand in a P clause (ver. 1^b), it is assumed that it must originally have been Elohim. This is all built upon the sand, however; for ver. 1 does not contain two identical statements. The second is an advance upon the first, stating that the purpose of the visitation was to fulfil a promise, and what that promise was is further stated in ver. 2. All is closely connected and progressive throughout, and it cannot be rent asunder as the critics propose. Jehovah, the God of Abraham, visited Sarah, and fulfilled his word to her, and Sarah bare her son at the set time that Elohim, the mighty Creator, had said; where there is specific allusion to the promise of God who appeared as the Almighty in xvii. 19, 21. The names are in every way appropriate as they stand.*

In Abimelech's interview with Abraham, resulting in the naming of Beersheba, the name of God is appropriately Elohim (xxi. 22, 23); but when Abraham worshipped there, he called with equal propriety on the name of Jehovah (ver. 33). The critics ignoring the true reason of the interchange of names, tell us that ver. 33 is a fragment of J inserted by R in a narrative of E.

In chap. xxii Elohim puts Abraham to the trial, the angel

* Kautsch seems to be alone in venturing to split xxxix. 3 and 5 in a similar manner, and giving the second clause in each verse to E with its Jehovah converted into Elohim.

of Jehovah interposes and blesses him. The demand of the Creator for the surrender of the dearest and the best is supplemented by the God of grace and salvation, who approves and rewards the mental surrender, and in the substituted animal supplies for the time then present an accepted type of the true sacrifice. This obviously designed and significant change of names is lost upon the critics, who find merely the unmeaning usage of distinct writers, and can only account for Moriah,* ver. 2, or Jehovah, ver. 11, as textual errors, and for the repeated occurrence of Jehovah subsequently by making vers. 14-18 an interpolation by R or an insertion from J. But the alleged interpolation is plainly an essential part of the narrative; the story of such a trial so borne is pointless without the words of commendation and blessing.

Isaac's blessing of Esau (xxvii. 27, 28) is torn asunder because Jehovah in the first sentence is followed by Elohim in the second.

So Jacob's dream, in which he beholds the angels of Elohim (xxviii. 12) and Jehovah (ver. 13); although his waking (ver. 16) from the sleep into which he had fallen (vers. 11, 12) shows that these cannot be parted. Jacob's vow (vers. 20, 21) is arbitrarily amended by striking out "then shall Jehovah be my God" because of his previous mention of Elohim, when referring to his general providential benefits.

The story of the birth of Leah's first four sons (xxix. 31-35), and that of the fifth and sixth (xxx. 17-20) are traced to different documents notwithstanding their manifest connection, because Jehovah occurs in the former and Elohim in the latter.

Elohim in xxxi. 50, in a so-called J paragraph, is for that reason summarily pronounced spurious.

Since Elohim occurs in xxxiii. 5^b, 11, these are declared to be isolated clauses from E in a J section.

The battle with Amalek (Ex. xvii. 8-13) is assigned to E because of Elohim (ver. 9); but the direction to record it, the commemorative altar, and the oath of perpetual hostility to Amalek (vers. 14-16), which stand in a most intimate relation to it, are held to be from another document, because of Jehovah.

In Jethro's visit (Ex. xviii) Elohim (11 times) naturally preponderates in what is said by or to one not of the chosen race; and yet Jehovah is used (6 times) where there is specific allusion to the God of Israel. But each Jehovah clause must, according to the critics, have been inserted in E's narrative by R from an assumed parallel account by J.

Ex. xix is mainly referred to E; but the repeated occurrence of

* A compound proper name with an abbreviated form of Jehovah as one of its constituents.

Jehovah compels the critics to assume that R has in several instances substituted it for Elohim, and even made more serious changes in the text.

Ex. xxiv is divided between E and J; but the division cannot be so made as to correspond with the divine names in the current text.

No critic pretends to follow the indication of the divine names in dissecting Ex. xxxii.

Dr. Harper, in the *Hebraica*, VI, 1, p. 35, says of the critical analysis of Ex. i. 1–vii. 7: “The language is but a poor guide, owing probably to R’s interference; not even the names of the deity are to be relied on implicitly, being freely intermingled.” And p. 47 on Ex. vii. 8–xii. 51: “In this section the name of the deity is exclusively Jehovah, which must have been substituted by R in all the E passages.” In the *Hebraica*, VI, 4, p. 269, he confesses that Jehovah runs “all through E’s material” in the section Num. x. 29–xvii. 28; and p. 287 complains in regard to Num. xx. 1–xxvii. 11 of “the unsatisfactory use of the names of the Deity; Yahweh is the prevailing name, Elohim occurring but nine times in the entire section; this is, however, more easily explained on the R hypothesis than by any other.” That is to say, the use of the divine names runs athwart the critical hypothesis to such an extent as to be quite unsatisfactory to its advocates. And the easiest way out of the difficulty is to assume that R has altered the name wherever the exigencies of the hypothesis require such a supposition.

For the striking significance of the divine names in the history of Balaam (Num. xxii–xxiv) the critics have no appreciation, but seek to resolve all by their mechanical rule of blended documents. The occurrence of Elohim four times in xxii. 2–21 is urged as determining it to belong to E; but Jehovah also occurs four times, where it is assumed that the word was originally Elohim, but it has been changed by R. Jehovah predominates in vers. 22–35 J, but Elohim is found in ver. 22, for which R is again held responsible. The next two chapters are divided between the same two documents, but with some uncertainty to which each should belong. Wellhausen assigns chap. xxiii to J, and chap. xxiv to E; Dillmann reverses it, giving chap. xxiii to E, and chap. xxiv to J. But however they dispose of them, the divine names will not suit, and R must be supposed to have manipulated them here again.

The real facts are these: Balaam only once uses Elohim (xxii. 38); and then it is to mark the contrast between the divine and the merely human. Apart from this he invariably uses the divine name Jehovah, whether he is speaking to Balak’s messengers (xxii. 8, 13, 18, 19), to Balak (xxiii. 3, 12, 26, xxiv. 13), or uttering his prophecies (xxiii. 8, 21, xxiv. 6). He thus indicates that it was

Jehovah whom he professed to consult, and whose will he undertook to declare. And it was because of his supposed power with the God of Israel that Balak desired his aid. Hence Balak uses Jehovah in addressing Balaam (xxiii. 17, xxiv. 11); only once Elohim (xxiii. 27), as non-Israelites commonly do. When the writer speaks of God in connection with this heathen seer, he steadfastly uses Elohim at the outset. Balaam regularly proposes to tell the messengers of Balak what Jehovah will say to him, but the writer with equal uniformity says that Elohim came to him and spoke to him (xxii. 9, 10, 12, 20, 22). He is not recognized as an accredited prophet of Jehovah. But while it is only Elohim, the general term denoting the deity, which is put by the sacred writer in relation to Balaam considered as a heathen seer, it is the angel of Jehovah who comes forth to confront him on his unhallowed errand, and Jehovah the guardian and defender of Israel who constrains him to pronounce a blessing instead of a curse. Hence from xxii. 22 onward, wherever the writer speaks, he uses the name Jehovah, not only in the encounter by the way, but after his arrival as determining what he shall say. To this there are but two exceptions. In xxiii. 4, when Balaam has gone to look for auguries, "Elohim met him," reminding us that he was but a heathen seer still; yet it was Jehovah (vers. 5, 16) who put the word in his mouth. In xxiv. 2, "the Spirit of Elohim came upon him," expresses the thought that he was divinely inspired, and spoke by an impulse from above and not from promptings of his own; but his conviction that it was Jehovah's purpose to bless Israel kept him from seeking auguries as at other times (ver. 1). The partition hypothesis obliterates this nice discrimination entirely, and sees nothing but the unmeaning usage of different writers, coupled with R's arbitrary disturbance of the text for no imaginable reason.

This rapid survey of a few prominent passages sufficiently shows the character of the evasions by which the critics seek to cover up the lack of correspondence between their hypothesis and the textual phenomena of the divine names. This want of correspondence betrays itself in numerous signal instances. The attempts to relieve it are based on arbitrary assumptions, which are mere inferences from the hypothesis, which they are adduced to support. In this process passages which are inseparable are rent asunder, and in many cases the real significance of the divine names is ignored or marred. And as a further consequence, which is the main point that we set out to establish, Klostermann's indictment stands. The current hypothesis of the critics is built on minute verbal distinctions, which imply an accuracy and certainty of text, which they themselves unsettle by their frequent assumptions of errors and of

manipulations by the Redactor. If he altered the divine names, and inserted or modified clauses containing them in the instances and to the extent alleged, who is to vouch that he has been more scrupulous elsewhere? The hypothesis is self-destructive; for it can only be defended by arguments, which undermine its foundations.

What has been shown with regard to the divine names, can with equal readiness be established in relation to the diction, which is said to characterize each of the documents respectively. No account is here made of the various considerations by which the long array of words adduced as criteria of the different assumed writers are proved to be delusive and void of all significance. The one point now insisted upon is that the freedom with which the critics deal with the text containing these crucial words destroys all dependence on them as criteria. A very few examples must suffice.

"These are the generations, etc.," occurs as the title of successive sections of the Book of Genesis. The critics claim it as characteristic of P. But the very first time that it occurs (ii. 4), it is the heading of a J section (ii. 4-iv). But this, we are told, is due to a textual error. It has been improperly transposed by R, no one can tell why, from its former alleged position at the beginning of chap. i, for which, however, it is not suitable and where it could never have stood.* In xxxvii. 2 it introduces a section composed of alternate paragraphs of J and E, in which there is not a single sentence from P until xli. 46, and then not another until xlvi. 6. In xxv. 19 it is followed by long passages from J, interspersed with paragraphs from E, and with scarcely anything from P. In xxxvi. 9 it stands at the head of a section about which critics are divided; some refer it to P, others in large part to R or to JE.

It is alleged that each of the documents has its own phrase to note Pharaoh's continued obstinacy after the plagues; and this is carried through by means of a series of textual changes. In Ex. viii. 11 (E. V., ver. 15) J's word for "hardening" is joined with P's phrase "hearkened not unto them," which, it is said, must have been transposed from its proper position after ver. 3 (E. V., 7), P's word for "hardening" being dropped by R as superfluous after that of J, though R had no such scruple in ix. 34, 35, where both are used together. In ix. 12 "the heart of Pharaoh was hardened" has been changed to "Jehovah hardened the heart of Pharaoh;"

* "The generations of the heaven and of the earth" according to the acknowledged meaning and fixed usage of the terms as well as the uniform analogy of all the similar titles denote not their origin but their offspring. The section thus entitled must, therefore, give an account, not of the creation of the world, but of the first stage of human history, man being sprung alike from heaven and earth, his body formed from the dust of the ground and his spirit inbreathed from God.

while in ix. 35 the reverse change was made, the verse being sundered from its immediate context and attached elsewhere. The same is the case with x. 20, which though in a J context is attributed to E in spite of its having the wrong divine name, which as in other cases is traced to R.

It is claimed that the tables, on which the commandments were written, are called by J and E tables of stone, by D tables of the covenant, and by P tables of the testimony.* Yet in Ex. xxxi. 18 "tables of the testimony, tables of stone," occur together in a P sentence; the latter is alleged to belong to E, though there is nothing with which to connect it. It is necessary to assume that it was inserted here by R. In Ex. xxxii. 15 P's phrase, "the two tables of the testimony," is found in the midst of a JE section (xxxii. 1-xxxiv. 28), and these are the only words attributed to P in the entire section. R is here at fault again. In Ex. xxxiv. the three expressions occur in the same connected paragraph, and evidently in relation to the same objects: tables of stone (vers. 1, 4), on which were written the words of the covenant (ver. 28), and which are further called the tables of the testimony (ver. 29). The critics evade this identification by splitting up the narrative, and referring the separate parts to different transactions; thus making it appear that R has not only altered the text, but seriously perverted its meaning. D has tables of stone more frequently than tables of the covenant, and in Deut. ix. 9, 11, combines both in the same sentence.

Like instances might be indefinitely multiplied, but these are sufficient to show how the processes of criticism unsettle the text at the very points on which the whole critical scheme professedly rests.

Klostermann's further contention is that the true and satisfactory solution of the problem of the Pentateuch must be sought by a totally different method from this self-condemned hypothetical method of the modern school of critics, who "suspend hundred-weights of theory upon the slender hair" of minute verbal criticism (p. 46): and who, as he avers, give vent to all the thoughts that are fermenting in their brains, and the conjectures that pass through their minds, and their crude speculations, which it might be well enough to disclose to a circle of intimate friends, interested in them individually, but which are in no fit state to bring before the public, until proofs are added to conjectures, and they are lifted into the sphere of knowledge. These offered conjectures are thankfully and trustingly received by groups of tyros as standard coins, and added to the capital stock as a basis for further investigation, the isolated protest of the incredulous being silenced by the majority vote, and their proofs set aside either quietly or at the utmost

* So Dr. Briggs' *Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch*, p. 78.

by expending upon them a vigorous phrase (p. 80). And he repeats with emphasis, though it may be to dull ears, Gradgrind's charge to the school-teacher: "Stick to facts, sir! teach these boys nothing but facts. Facts alone are wanted in life. Root out everything else. You can only form the minds of reasoning animals upon facts" (p. 5).

He accordingly insists that instead of beginning with the critical analysis of Genesis, and attempting to carry the same *volens volens* through the Hexateuch, becoming, as it does, more overloaded and complicated as it proceeds, until it ends in Joshua in a veritable jumble, the true method is to begin with the body of the Pentateuch itself. And instead of starting with unknown quantities like the hypothetical documents, and tracing them downward through their successive editions and combinations, and the various additions and changes by the Redactors, until the completed Pentateuch is finally reached, he claims that the only sensible method is to reverse this process,—to start with the Pentateuch, as we possess it, which is a known and positive quantity, and trace this back to its origin by a careful study of it as a whole and in the relations of its several parts. We shall thus have firm footing, and know where we are, and can have a good hope of arriving at assured results.

He thus places himself "in the sharpest opposition to the modern Pentateuchal investigation, which tells us of a writing JE compounded from two sources by a third party, and another D married to it by a fifth, as the more recent Q and P, which at first existed separately, were coupled by an eighth, and that finally the children of these marriages, JED and QP, were united by an eleventh to produce the present Pentateuch. The most recent science is, to be sure, far from being content with this multiplicity of letters, reminding one of the formulas of chemistry, and so dissects each of these again into different numbers, and the process must go on until every verse and clause has its symbol bestowed upon it; and the wonderful discovery is reached that the Pentateuch, like every ancient document which has come down to us through a one-sided text-tradition, consists of a multitude of sentences, each of which must be tested in order to see whether in contents and form, logically and in its style, it is adapted to the place which it occupies, *i. e.*, whether it has been correctly transmitted. To us, who do not contemplate the present Pentateuchal text from above downwards as the result of the interaction of hypothetically assumed originals, but seek in cautious regression from the present to ascertain the primitive form of so many centuries ago, which the author gave his book, in order then to ask what literary materials he used and how he used them, this is nothing new. For we did not need the roundabout

way of the history of a book's origin from its sources to find out that the text of the completed book has had its history, and so we have been able to escape the blunder of practising misapprehended textual criticism, innocently supposing that we were engaged not in this but in a quest of sources with a view to history" (pp. 117, 118).

In order to carry into effect his idea that the general structure of the Pentateuch will reveal its origin, Klostermann fixes his eyes in the first instance upon the latter portion of it. He there finds a body of law (Deut. v-xxviii); an envelope encircling it (Deut. i-iv, xxix. 1-xxx. 13, 24-30, xxxii. 45-47); and these comprehended in a history which records the march from Sinai and the experiences of Israel under Moses until his death (Num. x. 11-xxxvi. 13, Deut. xxxi. 14-23, xxxii. 1-44, 48-52, xxxiii, xxxiv. 1-9). The question to be answered is, What is the mutual relation of these several parts, and how came they to be united as they now are? He takes as the starting point of his investigation the recorded fact of the discovery of the law in the reign of Josiah (2 Kgs. xxii), and its publicly assumed and admitted obligation. He argues that the book of the law then found was not the entire Pentateuch, nor the whole Mosaic law. For there was Mosaic law that was not lost, by which Hezekiah governed himself (2 Kgs. xviii. 6), and which Manasseh transgressed (xxi. 8, 9), and which, he thinks, must be distinguished from the law that was lost, and hence could not be said to be either obeyed or transgressed. When this lost law was found and added to that which was previously possessed, the statutes of Moses were complete; and it could now be said for the first time, as it is said of Josiah, that he walked in accordance with "all the law of Moses" (xxiii. 25). Though neither the high priest nor the king nor any one else then living knew of the prior existence of this law, nor of the occasion, nor even of the fact of its loss, it was attended with such evidences of genuineness as at once secured its universal acceptance, and made the suspicion of fraud or mistake absolutely impossible.

The law found was the Deuteronomic law. This is now inserted in the Book of Numbers, a term which for convenience Prof. Klostermann here uses out of its ordinary meaning to denote the aforesaid history from Sinai to the death of Moses. The critics say that in the time of Josiah Deuteronomy was united not with Numbers but with JE. But the facts are that we have the Deuteronomic law, and the Book of Numbers (in the sense just explained), and these combined by means of an intervening stratum, in which the law is enveloped apparently with the view of putting it in harmonious relation to the history. Now the office of the historical

investigator is to seek to comprehend the existing combination from the nature of the known quantities which enter into it. JE is a hypothesis; that it existed in the time of Josiah is a second assumption; that it was then the only authority respecting the Mosaic age, and consequently alone entitled to be combined with Deuteronomy, is a third pure hypothesis. Can the union of JE and D resting upon this triple hypothesis be anything but the spectral image of the union of Deuteronomy and Numbers, which is before our eyes?

In the face of the only and reliable historical account the critics claim that the Deuteronomic law was written in the time of Josiah as the programme of the prophetic party. It is hence inferred that it expresses the historical knowledge of Josiah's time, and is a standard by which to estimate the historical tradition of the Mosaic period then existing. And since Numbers ignores this or seems to be at variance with it, they draw the inference, not that their hypothesis is false, but that Numbers and the Pentateuch did not exist when Josiah's book was attached to the historical narrative. JE according to the critics themselves is in a fragmentary state, has been worked over, and contains foreign materials; it is particularly defective in the march from Sinai to Moab. But if they may be allowed to fill the gaps in JE from D, it is not strange if they can make JE and D agree.

The situation, then, according to Prof. Klostermann, was this. The newly discovered law offered many points of apparent disagreement with Numbers, which was the well-known standard authority for the Mosaic age. Numbers could not be altered to conform with Deuteronomy, nor Deuteronomy to conform with Numbers. Each was held sacred and inviolable. The problem was so to adjust them in time and place, and to supply such intermediary explanations, as should bring them into harmony, and enable the reader to pass from one to the other without being sensible of any incompatibility or conflict, so that both could be intelligently and without difficulty received as the work of the same Moses. This was the task imposed upon him who united the lately found book of the law with the old and familiar book of Mosaic history. And this was accomplished by placing the law of Deuteronomy precisely where it stands, and inserting the accompanying preface and conclusion. Prof. Klostermann points out in detail that the introductory and concluding chapters supply precisely the links which are needed to connect the Deuteronomic law with the history in Numbers, to correct possible misunderstandings and remove seeming contrarieties, whether in matters of fact or of teaching.

Much of the discussion devoted to this point is interesting and

instructive. Only he has transferred to the days of Josiah what took place in the closing period of Moses' life, and has attributed to the masterly adroitness of a harmonist's adjustments that real agreement in spite of apparent and superficial diversity which is simply due to the fact that the statements are all historically true.

Prof. Klostermann claims (pp. 150, 151), that by the preceding argument he has established four things in opposition to the current views of modern critics, viz.:

1. The rediscovered book of the law was so far from being the expression of what the pious in the age of Josiah knew about Moses' last instructions, that in order to make it intelligible and useful to them a preface and a supplement were required, to remove the seeming opposition, by supplying what was wanting and reconciling what appeared contradictory. It is thus an altogether impossible assumption that the book originated then, and embodied the ideas of the prophets and their followers, which were given out as Mosaic and at once accredited as such.

2. No change was made in the book of the law itself; but the offence, which it might naturally have created, was removed by preceding and following remarks, which are expressly indicated as such and clearly distinguished from the text of the book of the law, which has its own title and subscription. It is thus proved that this book was an inviolable authority, whose statements were not to be altered, but only the circumstances under which it said what it did, considered, in order that it might be rightly understood and the suitable sense be obtained from such ordinances as appeared strange.

3. The historical connection in which the oral delivery and the writing of the book of the law by Moses were put, in order to ensure the correct understanding of its contents, was that which is given in Numbers (in the sense above explained), from x. 11 to the death of Moses. This proves that the view which Josiah's contemporaries had of the Mosaic age, coincided with the testimony of the Book of Numbers.

4. The harmonizing of the book of the law with the Book of Numbers was not accomplished by changes and omissions in Numbers in order to adapt it to the book of law, but by enclosing the book of the law in such an envelope that it fitted into Numbers of itself in a suitable place. It is thus proved that before the finding of the law Numbers was already in possession of inviolable authority, and that this authority was in no respect diminished by the discovery of the book of the law with a like inviolable validity.

The weak points in Klostermann's argument, so far as it has now

been reviewed, grow out of his unwarranted concessions to prevalent critical ideas, from which he has not wholly emancipated himself. These involve him in inconsistencies, which his antagonists can easily point out, and then assume that they have refuted his argument;* whereas their removal strengthens what is really true in his position. His mistake consists in admitting: (1) That the law found in the temple was in such a sense lost that its previous existence was altogether unknown. How then did it suddenly and rightfully gain such absolute authority? (2) That the law of Deuteronomy was not connected with Numbers until the time of Josiah, and that the preface and conclusion, which form the connecting links, were written and inserted at that time. But as these are identical in language and style with the law itself, he assumes that the language of the law had been modernized and such modifications made in it, as adapted it better to practical ends (pp. 109, 123). But how is this consistent with the inviolable character attributed to it as proceeding from Moses? (3) That the text of the Pentateuch has undergone serious changes, and critical theories based on the assumption of its accuracy are for that reason invalid. Yet he bases his own arguments on the current text.

If these weaknesses were eliminated from his argument, and it were rested simply on the manifest interrelation between the law of Deuteronomy and the history in which it lies imbedded, as established in spite of apparent diversities by means of the prefatory addresses of Moses and his concluding remarks, all would be seen to be entirely congruous to the claim which it makes for itself, and which succeeding ages admitted as indisputable.

Prof. Klostermann next inquires into the extent of what he calls the pre-Josian Pentateuch. And this he does by an extension of the same method which he has previously pursued. The Deuteronomic law is by its preface and conclusion intimately linked with the history in which it is embedded, extending from the time of leaving Sinai (Num. x. 11) to the death of Moses and the succession of Joshua (Deut. xxxiv. 9). This, however, is evidently only a section of a much larger work. What indications does it afford of the extent and of the contents of the work of which it was a part?

Directions are given respecting the leadership of Joshua, the conquest of Canaan, its distribution by lot among the tribes, and other arrangements connected with the settlement in the land; from this he infers that the Book of Joshua, which narrates how these directions were carried into effect, must have been included in this his-

* Thus Dr. Driver, in *The Expositor* for May, 1892, contents himself with showing that Klostermann is as arbitrary and no more conservative than the critics whom he opposes, and then dismisses the whole case.

torical work. Here he makes the mistake so common with the critics of confounding the concatenation of events with the continuity of the work in which they are recorded. The scheme projected by Moses was incomplete at his death, and was accomplished by Joshua; the march through the wilderness was directed to the settlement in Canaan as its consummation. But a historian may be prevented from completing his work as well as a statesman; and it may devolve upon another to finish what his predecessor had begun. It is worth noting, however, that as Prof. Klostermann has previously shown that Deuteronomy is linked, not to the supposititious document JE, but to the Book of Numbers, so now he points out that the anticipations in Deuteronomy and Numbers look forward to the work of Joshua in its entirety. Consequently if the critical hypothesis of the continuity of the Hexateuch were conceded, the history in which Deuteronomy was set must have embraced, not a section of Joshua referable to JE, but the book in all its parts. The assumption that Joshua belonged to a historical work independent of and prior to Deuteronomy is, however, in open conflict with the repeated references in the Book of Joshua itself to the book of the law of Moses. And it necessitates the further assumption that these references are a later addition introduced when Deuteronomy came to be combined with the preëxisting history for the sake of harmonizing the united work. And the divisive critics are here again involved in inconsistency in alleging that Deuteronomy was only combined with what they consider the JE constituents of the Hexateuch, and not with P, whereas these so-called Deuteronomic additions are found attached to P as well.*

*Dr. Driver tries to escape from admitting this even in so plain a case as Josh. xx, which is assigned to P, while vers. 4, 5, 6b and an expression in ver. 3 are confessedly conformed to Deuteronomy. He says (*Literature of Old Testament*, p. 105), "It is remarkable that just these passages are omitted in the LXX. As no reason can be assigned for the omission of these passages by the LXX. translators, had they formed a part of the Hebrew texts which they used, it is probable that the chapter in its original form (P) has been enlarged by additions from the law of homicide in Deuteronomy (chap. xix) at a comparatively late date, so that they were still wanting in the MSS. used by the LXX. translators." The weakness of this argument is clearly shown by Dillmann (*Commentary on Joshua xx*), "If we consider that the LXX. have at least a small substitute for these verses, and further that whole verses and groups of verses, which seem unnecessary or difficult, are often omitted elsewhere in the LXX., it must be admitted to be possible here also, that the LXX. text is not to be taken as the standard, especially as some of P is lacking as well as what is Deuteronomic. But if any undertake to support the priority of the LXX. text over the Massoretic by the assertion that no traces of the Deuteronomic reviser occur elsewhere in P paragraphs, it must be said on the contrary that this will not answer for v. 10, ix. 18f., xiii. 20ff., chap. xxii, and that there are a multitude of proofs to show that the Deuteronomic reviser knew and used P."

Prof. Klostermann, while contending that Joshua was an original part of the historical work, into which Deuteronomy was inserted, is equally strenuous in maintaining that by the insertion of Deuteronomy this connection was severed. The closing verses of Deut. xxxiv. 10-12 sunder all that follows from what precedes, as the regulated from the regulating. The law of Moses prescribes; Joshua obeys. So that the Book of Joshua was henceforth to be regarded as opening a new period, and standing at the head of the succeeding historical books. He claims, therefore, that Hexateuch is a misnomer.

Prof. Klostermann is more successful in tracing the connection of Deuteronomy backward than he is in tracing it forward. And he finds clear evidence that the antecedent work, to which it was attached, covered the entire territory embraced in the preceding books of the Pentateuch, and that this was so knit together in all its parts as to form a unit. The sections and paragraphs which critics assign to P, as well as those assigned to JE, must all alike have been included in the work of which Deuteronomy became the concluding portion.

Deut. i. 1, 2, according to its most probable and, as Prof. Klostermann contends, its only rational interpretation, is a summary of what immediately precedes, viz., the legislation of the Book of Numbers, and is contrasted with what follows (ver. 3), the addresses and the laws contained in Deuteronomy. "These be the words which Moses spake unto all Israel" in four several localities, which are distinctly specified, (1) "beyond Jordan," (2) "in the wilderness" east of Moab, (3) "in the Arabah over against the Red sea," the deep valley extending from the Dead Sea to the Ælanitic gulf, (4) in the space "between Paran and . . . Hazeroth," over which Israel passed in "their eleven days' journey from Horeb by the way of Mount Seir unto Kadesh-barnea." In these verses the varied legislation of the Book of Numbers from the time of leaving Horeb, on the twentieth day of the second month of the second year, to the first day of the eleventh month of the fortieth year when Deuteronomy opens, is described by the localities, where it originated, taken in a reverse order (p. 130). This is here represented to be what we actually find it, "a collection of post-Sinaitic ordinances of Moses, not systematically arranged by subjects, but historico-geographically by the stations successively occupied by Israel between their leaving Horeb and crossing the Jordan" (p. 156). That this work contained history as well as law is shown by the recapitulation in Deut. i. 6-iii. 29. In addition to the arrangement of the material by localities, the term of forty years spent in the wilderness affords an opportunity for a chronological disposition of it, at least during the last year, since thirty-eight years are passed in compara-

tive silence (Deut. ii. 14). Further, both the preface to the Deuteronomic law (Deut. iv. 9-14), and the subscription to it (Deut. xxviii. 69: E. V., xxix. 1) presuppose a law previously given at Horeb; such a body of law actually precedes Num. x. 11, which is declared (Lev. xxvi. 46, xxvii. 34) to be the divine statutes given at Sinai. This portion of our existing Pentateuch thus corresponds with the intimations of Deuteronomy; and we can with confidence proceed on this basis to reconstruct the entire work.

In connection with the census in the plains of Moab (Num xxvi. 63, 64), explicit reference is made to a preceding census in the wilderness of Sinai (Num. i). The account of the march from Sinai after the laws given there implies a like account of the march to Sinai by the people set free from the bondage of Egypt. Such an account is found in Ex. xii-xix, in which significant events, divine communications and the words of Moses are wrought into an itinerary precisely as in Numbers. "All makes the impression that one writer has consistently arranged the vast mass of varied matter by a well-considered plan. This becomes an undoubted certainty, when we reconstruct the calendar of the forty years' wandering, which is parallel to the itinerary and naturally goes with it hand in hand, and observe that occasional dates, only casually occurring in the varied material and having no intentional reference to a chronological scheme, nevertheless have their appropriate place in it" (p. 159).

Prof. Klostermann here enters upon a detailed examination of the chronological data from the time of leaving Egypt to the thirty days' mourning after the death of Moses. He enumerates all the dates explicitly given, and all the incidental allusions in the narratives to periods of time, or suggestions from which a duration longer or shorter can be inferred. And he points out the marvellous exactness of the correspondence throughout. It is particularly noteworthy that these varied data are not confined to any one of the so-called critical documents, but are scattered through them all; and yet they constitute together one harmonious and indivisible scheme. The incidental statements fall precisely into place; and when the numbers, which they furnish with no apparent reference to a chronological scheme, are summed up, they tally exactly with the definite dates which are given from time to time.

Prof. Klostermann explains this by the careful elaboration of the historian, who wrought out the definite dates from the materials from which he composed his history; and who must have had before him the entire material which the critics partition among the different documents, in order to reach the chronological scheme which is here presented. But the facts which he has developed

do not point to a studied chronological calculation on the basis of the data furnished by the incidents of the history. They find a much more natural explanation in the accuracy of the record, and its conformity both in specific dates and incidental statements to the facts of the case. And the interrelation of all the parts, the mutual correspondence of casual allusions and of express affirmations, and the needed presence of all the particulars to the completeness of the whole, establish the unity of the record, in opposition to the critical assumption that it has been compounded of separate and independent documents.

Israel's history has its roots in the patriarchal age, and this again leads up to the antediluvian period, and so on to the creation; all this is now in the Pentateuch and properly there. The numerical correspondences, the chronological disposition of the whole and the mingling of legal with historical matter resemble the portions previously examined, and lead to the same conclusion as before, unity of design and arrangement involving unity of authorship. The argument on the whole is valid, notwithstanding some fanciful conceits such as the interpretation put upon the fourth generation in Gen. xv. 16 (pp. 181, 182). In a work which divides Genesis by a series of uniform titles into ten generations, and which numbers ten links of descent from Adam to Noah, and ten from Shem to Abraham, and ten commandments, and ten plagues in Egypt, can it be supposed that this last number is the accidental result of combining three different accounts by E, J, and P, who severally report five, seven and five plagues?

The itinerary of the wilderness leads to the same conclusion as the chronology. Prof. Klostermann draws an argument of unity from this source likewise, but with less cogency than he might have done, if he had made Num. xxxiii the basis on which to rest his inference. That chapter contains a list of the stations along the entire route of Israel from Egypt to Canaan, which purports to be from the hand of Moses. The total disregard of the document hypothesis by this venerable itinerary, and of the divisions in the narrative which that hypothesis creates, makes it the dismay of the critics. And they seek in every way to dispose of a document which so effectually disposes of them and of their theories.

Kayser* says of it: "The list of stations is commonly regarded as an ancient writing found by the Elohist (P), and incorporated by him in his work. Nevertheless the most serious scruples arise against this assumption from the circumstance that it contains the series of stations, enlarged to be sure, yet in the same order as they stand in the present Pentateuch, and interwoven with remarks

**Das vorexilische Buch*, p. 97.

which may be read now in the Jehovist, now in the Elohist." Inasmuch as this list traces the very route marked out in the Pentateuch, not that indicated in P alone, nor in JE alone, but that which results from their combination; and as in repeated instances it contains statements found in identical language sometimes in one, sometimes in another; Kayser maintains that it cannot be either ancient or reliable, but that it must be posterior to the Pentateuch in its completed form, and made up from it either by the Redactor or by some one later still. And he seeks to confirm this depreciating estimate of it by the fact that forty-two stations are named, and if two be omitted there will be precisely forty, just one for each of the forty years spent in the wilderness; and Israel is said to have remained about a year at Sinai. The absurdity of this combination is sufficiently glaring, as ten stations precede Sinai, the journey to which occupied less than two months; and the ten stations after Kadesh were passed in as many months. The list could not have been made from the narratives of the Pentateuch, for it has many names of which there is no previous mention; the allegation that these are fictitious and a pure fabrication is a groundless charge of fraud. And the invention of a bald list of names would be a senseless and unmeaning fraud, for which no motive can be imagined.

It is not surprising that Kayser felt compelled in the interest of the divisive hypothesis to contest the antiquity and truthfulness of this Mosaic itinerary, and to claim that it could only have originated after P and JE had been compacted together into the Pentateuch in its present form. If P possessed this venerable itinerary, and believed it to be from the pen of Moses, and used it as one of the sources from which he drew his materials in compiling his narrative, how can it be explained that in repeated instances he omits to mention incidents recorded in the itinerary and the stations at which they took place? and that just those incidents and stations are noted, and in the very language of the itinerary, in another document JE, whose authors according to the critics could not have been acquainted with it, since they incorporate (xxi. 12-20) an independent list of stations quite inconsistent, as they allege, with that in chap. xxxiii?

Kuenen agrees with Kayser. He says:* "Chap. xxxiii. 1-49, the list of stations in the journey through the desert, which, according to ver. 2 was written down by Moses himself, presupposes the accounts in P, but it also assumes the other accounts of Israel's abode in the desert, and can only have been drawn up and inserted by R." And again:† "The agreement of Num. xxxiii. 1-49 in lan-

* *Hexateuch*, p. 98.

† *Ibid.*, p. 102. See also p. 336.

guage and contents with P is generally allowed, and the passage has therefore usually been assigned to that work. But this is inconsistent with the references to events related elsewhere; and since the comparison with the parallel passages leaves no room to doubt the priority of the latter, the only hypothesis left is that Num. xxxiii. 1-49 is compiled from various sources, including the narratives of our Pentateuch."

Wellhausen does not declare himself distinctly on the subject, but appears to accept the view of Kayser. He says:* "Though I cannot honestly concede the list of stations (xxxiii. 1-49) to P, I would be willing to do so on the ground that thus P would be clearly shown to be posterior to JE; for Kayser has established at least in a number of cases that JE is sometimes used here as well as P." This hints at a possible hypothesis, which, however, Wellhausen does not himself adopt, and which would be as unavailing as that of Kayser, that P was the author of this chapter, and in preparing it inserted from JE the verses identical with those elsewhere assigned to this document. But: (1) The assumption that P was in possession of JE and acquainted with its contents would be embarrassing to the critics in the numerous passages in which they are compelled to make the opposite assumption. (2) This hypothesis makes ver. 2 a wilful fraud, P giving out as the work of Moses a list of stations which he has prepared himself; or if it be said that P prepared it on the basis of an ancient itinerary reputed to be from Moses, it is open to the same fatal objection that lies against the view of Dillmann now to be stated.

Dillmann in his Commentary on this passage attempts to remove this stumbling block out of the way of the critics by a different method, but one equally impracticable. He rejects the baseless conjecture of Kayser and his followers that this list was made up by the Redactor or some one else from the narratives of the Pentateuch, on three grounds: (1) "Ver. 2 distinctly teaches that the author here used an ancient document, which in his time was attributed to Moses." (2) "There is a long series of names which do not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch." (3) "Altogether variant parallels to vers. 29-37, 41-47 are found in Deut. x. 6, 7, Num. xxi. 12-20. These parallels, which belong to J and E, show that divergent lists or different recensions of the same list were in circulation, and make it only the more certain that this list belongs to P," whose "mode of expression and peculiarities of matter everywhere appear." He undertakes to account for this correspondence in style with P, when it is not a production of his, by the assumption that it was "worked over by him, and that he inserted vers. 1-4, 36-39,"

* *Composition des Hexateuchs*, p. 182.

in which the expressions are identical with previous passages in P. The passages identical with JE, ver. 8sq., 14sq., 16sq., 40, 49 are, he alleges, interpolations by R. But this unsupported conjecture of his is as inconsistent with ver. 2, even on his understanding of it, as that which he rejects. Such deliberate falsifications both by P and R of a document believed by them to be from the pen of Moses, and given as such to their readers, is quite insupposable without an impeachment of their veracity which would make all their work utterly unreliable. Moses is made to verify their previous statements in matters of which, by the hypothesis, he said nothing. Moreover when these alleged interpolations are stricken out, the itinerary in its presumed original form would stand in no relation whatever to the narrative of Israel's sojourn in the desert, and the marvel is that it should be introduced at all. It would be reduced to a mere curiosity of no practical worth, and having no link of connection with the history.

If, now, this ancient itinerary can neither be from P nor R, and cannot have been interpolated either by P or R, the only alternative consistent with the good faith of the writer is that the passages in the Pentateuchal narrative which correspond to it, and which are severally ascribed by the critics to P and JE, are by one author who was acquainted with this list, and who believed it to be from the pen of Moses. And why may he not have been correctly informed? What is there to hinder our believing that this list of stations really was written by Moses, and that the corresponding narratives were his likewise? This chapter is in harmony with the traditional origin of the Pentateuch, but it is not in harmony with any of the divisive schemes, and it cannot be brought into accord with them.*

The two main points in Klostermann's indictment of the modern critics appear to be well sustained. They are self-contradictory in their dealing with the text. They disregard the structural unity of the Pentateuch. This unity is argued by him solely from the chronology, and the itinerary of the desert. A detailed examination of the critical partition and of the multitudinous links of con-

* The variance which Dillmann alleges with Deut. x and Num. xxi is only apparent, not real. As neither Num. xxi. 12-20 nor Num. xxxiii. 1-49 undertakes to name every stopping place, the mention in one of localities not named in the other is no inconsistency; especially as the same encampment of so vast a host might receive different names from the different places which it covered. As Num. xxxiii. 31-33 belongs before the second arrival at Kadesh and Deut. x. 6, 7 after it, the different order in which the stations are named can create no difficulty. Israel passed through them twice by a slightly varied route. Nor is it a discrepancy that Deuteronomy names Moserah as the place of Aaron's death, and Numbers Mt. Hor, provided Moserah, as there is every reason to believe, lay at the foot of Mt. Hor.

nection which it violently sunders, together with the weakness of the grounds on which the partition is based, would immensely strengthen and confirm his argument, and show that the critics have undertaken to accomplish the impracticable with a very slender equipment. Prof. Klostermann accordingly has the right to consider it "proved that the old Book of Numbers was an integral part of a great work, which extended from the beginnings of Israel and their preliminary history to the settlement in Canaan, and that . . . this book is before us to-day in material and structure in Gen. i-Num. xxxvi" (p. 185). We only except to the statements, which we have dropped from the sentence just quoted, that Deuteronomy was first added to Numbers in the time of Josiah, giving rise to several redactional changes, and that the Book of Joshua was included in the same work.

And he goes on to say (p. 186), that to refer this great work to an obscure personage in the exile, a Redactor who can nowhere be distinctly grasped, who, when he has the simplest sentence to utter, opens his conflicting sources and from them painfully glues together disparate catch words,* is to kill outright its tangible and living author. And to convert the chronological frame, in which he has set the material suitably disposed for it, into a source of his book bearing the fine symbols Q or P or QP, is as ingenious as if one were to derive the dates and periods, under which an author arranges the history of the first thousand years after Christ, from a primer in which the numbers from 0-1000 were set down for a child learning his figures. Wellhausen recognizes that these dates and this chronological scheme could have no meaning or existence but from their intentional reference to the concrete material which is distributed under them. According to the critical analysis, however, this material is not actually connected with them, but belongs to other documents than that to which the chronological scheme is attributed; so that it becomes necessary to assume that the latter once had a detailed narrative with about the same contents as are now arranged under this scheme, but which the critics detach from it. The Elohist (P) of the early critics was regarded by them as the primitive foundation document, which lay at the base of Genesis and of the entire Pentateuch. But from the oldest it has become the most recent, from the most reliable the least trustworthy; it has been denuded of nearly all of its narrative and reduced to scat-

* *E. g.*, Gen. xxx. 22: "And God remembered Rachel (P), and God hearkened to her (E), and opened her womb (J)." Num. xiv. 1, 2: "And all the congregation (P) lifted up their voice, and cried; and the people wept that night (J). And all the children of Israel murmured (E) against Moses and against Aaron (P)."

tered scraps. And now this wretched hotch-potch which the critics have made of it, such as never could have existed by itself, is treated as though it were an independent document, and the whole Pentateuch was built upon it.

Prof. Klostermann next introduces a long and complicated and very trivial argument (pp. 188-218), to prove that the Book of Numbers originally ended with chap. xxvii, and this was immediately followed by Deut. xxxiii, xxxiv; and that Num. xxviii. 1-xxxvi. 13, Deut. xxxi. 14-23, xxxii. 1-44, 48-52 was a later addition, which, however, was made prior to the insertion of the Deuteronomic law with its preface and conclusion. The ground for this extraordinary allegation is that he cannot conceive how so much can have taken place between the original announcement to Moses of his approaching end (Num. xxvii. 12, 13), and his actual departure (Deut. xxxiv. 1); or why the announcement should have been renewed (Deut. xxxii. 48-52); or when the Lord summoned Moses and Joshua to the tabernacle that he might give the latter a charge (Deut. xxxi. 14, *sq.*), why he should join with it directions respecting the song to be taught the children of Israel as a witness against them in their foreseen transgression. These imaginary difficulties, which the critics are in the habit of urging in the interest of their so-called documents, Klostermann seeks to utilize for his own special purpose; and he has just as little reason for his conclusion as they for theirs. The narrative is perspicuous, consistent, and entirely credible as it stands, and requires no tinkering for its correction.

Three additional articles are republished in this volume, which have long been before the public, and need not be remarked upon here, viz., the admirable *Exposition of the Song of Moses* (Deut. xxxii), which first appeared in 1871, followed by *Ezekiel and the Holiness Law* in 1877, and the *Significance of the Year of Jubilee in the Calendar* in 1880.

PRINCETON.

WILLIAM HENRY GREEN.